REMARKS

Claims 1-40 were pending. Claims 1-40 were rejected. Claims 1-40 are currently pending.

Amendment to the Specification

The specification has been amended to correct a typographical error. Support for the amendment may be found on page 10, lines 28-31 of the applicants' specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U. S. Patent No. 3,958,509 issued to James E. MURRAY et al. (hereinafter Murray), U. S. Patent No. 5,930,009 issued to Tsuneo SATO et al. (hereinafter Sato), U. S. Patent No. 5,493,386 issued to John R. THOMPSON (hereinafter Thompson) and U. S. Patent No. 6,647,126 issued to Xin WEN (hereinafter Wen).

Claims 2-5, 14-18, 25-29, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Murray, Sato, Thompson, Wen and U.S. Patent No. 5,592,298 issued to Angelo T. CARUSO (hereinafter Caruso).

Claims 6-8, 19-21 and 30-32 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Murray, Sato, Thompson, Wen, Caruso and U.S. Patent No. 6,027,200 issued to Kazuyoshi TAKAHASHI et al. (hereinafter Takahashi).

Claims 9-11, 22-24 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Murray, Sato, Thompson, Wen, Caruso, Takahashi, and U.S. Patent No. 5,802,420 issued to Charles Michael GARR et al. (hereinafter Garr).

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Murray, Sato, Thompson, Wen and U.S. Patent No. 5,905,894 issued to Jeremy S. DE BONET (hereinafter De Bonet).

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Murray, Sato, Thompson, Wen and U.S. Patent No. 5,782,567 issued to Katsuyuki ENDO (hereinafter Endo).

Claims 38-40 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Murray, Sato, Thompson, Wen, and U.S. Patent No. 6,377,359 issued to Kimihiko HIGASHIO et al. (hereinafter Higashio).

REGARDING THE CITED ART

As noted by the examiner in the rejection of claim 1, Murray does not expressly disclose an apparatus in which the logo data and the ink-amount data are displayed simultaneously, such that when a change is made to the displayed logo data, the ink-amount calculating unit recalculates an ink-amount for printing the changed logo data in substantially real-time, and the display unit displays the changed logo data and the recalculated ink amount simultaneously, as recited in claim 1.

The examiner has suggested that Murray may be modified to include this feature. The applicants respectfully disagree. Murray discloses an apparatus which estimates the amount of ink that separate zones of a printing plate require. The process disclosed by Murray requires the scanning of a printing plate. In order for the amount of ink to be recalculated using the process disclosed by Murray, any change in the logo data would necessitate a change in the printing plate. The production of a new printing plate is a time consuming and expensive process, which does not allow for the recalculated ink amount and the changed logo data to be displayed in substantially real time as recited in claim 1. Thus, there is no meaningful way in which Murray could be modified to disclose the invention recited in claim 1, while still retaining the method for calculating the amount of ink. For at least this reason claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

As noted by the examiner Sato discloses a method in which an original image is displayed. Graphs corresponding to the original image are also displayed at the same time as the original image. When a change is initiated by a operator an adjusted image is displayed and graphs corresponding to the adjusted image are also displayed. Sato does present this method as a series of sequential steps.

Although the graphs are recalculated, Sato does not suggest or disclose that the graphs are calculated in substantially real time. Sato makes no mention of the amount of time needed to perform these steps. Displaying a modified image and a recalculated graph simultaneously is not equivalent to displaying the recalculated graph in real time. This is an additional reason as to why claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

The applicants respectfully disagree with the examiner's rejection of claim 13. The applicants would like to note that the phrase "image data stored in the transaction printer for printing on a print sheet" as recited in claim 13 should be interpreted in light of the applicants' specification on page 11, lines 18-27. The examiner indicated in the Response to Arguments regarding Endo, page 21, lines 4-10 that POS station may include a computer and logo data must be stored in the POS personal computer. A POS printer is separate from a POS station. As noted in the applicant's specification:

> printer throughput drops, however, when all print data, including the image data, is sent from the host for each print operation because image data files are large.

Thus, claim 13 recites storing the image data in the printer, which should be distinguished from storing the image data on the POS personal computer as suggested by the examiner. For at least this reason claim 13 is patentable over the cited art.

Claims 14, 25, 38 and 39 are allowable over the cited art for substantially the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 2-13, 26-37 and 40 are allowable at least because they are dependent upon an allowable base claim.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel A. Ratoff/

Daniel A. Ratoff
Registration No. 54,389

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
2580 Orchard Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95131
Phone: (408) 952-6030
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178

Date: November 1, 2006